

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/623,198	BARETZ ET AL.
	Examiner Thao X. Le	Art Unit 2814

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thao X. Le. (3) _____

(2) Mr. Steven Hultquist. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 20 August 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 31,35 and 43.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stevenson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Thao X Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2814

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1) request to enter the secondary evidence after final rejection and/or remove the finality 2) the secondary evidence will enter if it is proper. 3) the issue of Stevenson in combination with the prior art of record would not be the meaning to one ordinary in the art of the teaching of Stevenson in col.3 and 4, but rather the phosphor and LED of Stevenson and others are capable of producing the same function as claimed. 4) the obviousness of replacing the fluorescent lamps with LED .